

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**RONALD FRANK FIDGE,**  
Plaintiff,

v.

**LAKE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, ET**  
**AL.,**  
Defendants.

Case No. 13-cv-05182-YGR

**ORDER VACATING DECEMBER 16, 2014**  
**HEARING ON SUMMARY JUDGMENT**  
**MOTIONS**

Now before the Court is the request of Plaintiff Ronald Frank Fidge to Vacate the Hearing regarding the Motion for Summary Judgment of Defendants Lake County Sheriff's Department. (Dkt. No. 113.) Lake County has opposed the request. (Dkt. No. 116.)

The instant request is not a model of clarity. In support thereof, plaintiff asserts that defendants were required to file and serve a letter brief requesting a pre-filing conference in support of their motion for summary judgment. As the Court previously explained in its Order of October 31, 2014, no such letter brief or pre-filing conference is required in this case. (Dkt. No. 108.) Plaintiff's request that the hearing on summary judgment be vacated on this basis is therefore **DENIED**.

Plaintiff also appears to take issue with the quality of certain evidence provided by defendants during discovery. Plaintiff's argument on this point, however, appears to be fully encompassed by plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions, which is in effect a motion to compel. (Dkt. No. 130.) That motion is currently pending before Magistrate Judge Vadas. (Dkt. No. 133.) To the extent that the instant request rests on plaintiff's contention that defendants have failed to provide requested discovery, plaintiff's later-filed motion for sanctions addresses this issue and will be resolved in due course.

The Court is sensitive to the fact that as a pro se plaintiff, Mr. Fidge is at a relative


1 disadvantage in terms of navigating federal civil procedure and legal principles and must be  
2 afforded leniency. To that end, the Court specifically provided plaintiff contact information for  
3 the Legal Help Center in its Order of March 6, 2014 (Dkt. No. 43) and has granted appropriate  
4 deadline extensions. Indeed, having granted Mr. Fidge's earlier request for extension of deadlines  
5 by Order of August 7, 2014, fact discovery closed in this case on **September 19, 2014**, and expert  
6 discovery closed on **October 27, 2014**. (Dkt. No. 79.) Those deadlines have long since passed,  
7 but in an effort to afford Mr. Fidge leniency, the Court has permitted him to pursue at the present  
8 time what is essentially a discovery dispute.

9 Given that this dispute remains pending, the Court hereby **VACATES** the hearing on the  
10 parties' motions for summary judgment currently set for December 16, 2014, to be reset at a later  
11 date if necessary.

12 This terminates Docket No. 113.

13  
14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: December 11, 2014

16  
17   
18 YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28